



ATTACHMENT A Remarks

Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being “unpatentable over” the previously cited Peng patent in view of the newly cited Moore et al (“Moore”) patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed although the independent claims have been amended in order to more clearly distinguish over the references cited.

Considering the amended independent claims, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 4 and the recitation of that subject matter has been expanded upon. Thus claim 1, as amended, provides that a further one of said at least three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences.

In the rejection of claim 4 (which was grouped with claims 2-6), the Examiner contends that Peng discloses “wherein one of said variables may be filled by a wildcard” and refers to Figure 8, Figure 3b, and refers to column 5, lines 1-3 and 48-65. Figures 8 and 3a have been carefully considered as have the portions of column 5 to which the Examiner has made reference, but applicant is unable to discern any teaching therein of the provision of a wildcard much less a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, patentably defines over the Peng patent, even assuming for the sake of argument that the combination of the Peng and Moore patents is a proper one.

Amended independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, that the data stored in the computer registry includes preference data comprising a combination of an identifier and a value. Claim 11 is based, in part, on claim 23, and claim 23 has been rejected on Moore which is said to teach “wherein at least one of said stored data further includes preference data” citing lines 55-67 of column 26 of Moore. Lines 55-67 of column 26 of Moore relate to an example of how physical location information can be reported by the NLRSP. More specifically, these lines provide that “[t]he information returned by the NLRSP 1200 contains the fields previously described in item 600 of FIG. 7B plus a physical location field 1202, a location method field 1204, and an error range field 1206. These lines further provide that “this embodiment gives the user two records and

applications check both before deciding how to proceed” and that “the first method returns the physical location of the user’s home.” It is respectfully submitted that the passages from Moore on which the Examiner has relied in rejecting claim 23 do not disclose storing preference data in a computer registry much less preference data comprising a combination of an identifier and of a value.

Turning to independent claim 14, this claim has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 18 as well as additional subject matter, and recites the step of “filling one of said variables with a wildcard for enabling default settings to be set for (i) users not listed in the computer registry and (ii) for users listed in the registry but having no preferences.” This recitation is supported, for example, by lines 16 and 17 of page 9.

As indicated above, it is respectfully submitted that the Peng patent does not provide for filling in one of the variables with a wildcard. Further, Peng certainly does not teach or suggest that any wildcard should be a wildcard which enables default settings to be set for both users not listed in the computer registry and users listed in the registry but not having preferences.

Turning to the dependent claims, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of the claims parent thereto, and, in addition, some of these claims recite separately patentable features. For example, claim 19 recites the step of “deleting one or more data items that has been superceded by a subsequent data having same identifier but a higher time stamp value.” The Examiner has referred to element 810 of Figure 8 of Peng in rejecting this claim. Step 810 simply provides for removing “the posted application selected records from the mobile application selection table.” As described at lines 4-8 of column 9, this is done for “that array of application selection records that were successfully posted at the gateway 108 (step 810).” It is respectfully submitted that the Peng patent makes no reference to deleting one or more data items that have been superceded by a subsequent data having the same identifier but a higher time value. Similar remarks apply to new claim 25 which is similar to claim 19.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS